



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,364	05/30/2001	Raphael M. Segler	SRQ-100-A	8345

7590 06/19/2006

William M. Hanlon, Jr.  
Young & Basile, P.C.  
Suite 624  
3001 West Big Beaver Road  
Troy, MI 48084

EXAMINER

AKINTOLA, OLABODE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/870,364	SEGLER, RAPHAEL M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olabode Akintola	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/13/2004</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to applicant's communication filed on 10/09/2001. Preliminary amendment has been entered. Claims 1-3 and 6-22 are pending. Claims 4 and 5 have been canceled. Claims 21 and 22 are new.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-3 and 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically the claimed invention as a whole does not accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." See *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (*Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96); *In re Ziegler*, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, a complete disclosure should contain some indication of the practical application for the claimed invention. Apart from the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, usefulness under the patent eligibility standard requires significant functionality to be present to satisfy the useful result aspect of the practical application requirement. See *Arrhythmia*, 958 F.2d at 1057, 22 USPQ2d at 1036. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make the invention eligible for patenting. However, the mere fact that the claim may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C.

101 does not mean that a useful result is achieved under the practical application requirement. The claim may be interpreted in an alternative as involving no more than a manipulation of an abstract idea and therefore is non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The claimed invention as a whole must produce a “useful, concrete and tangible” result to have a practical application. Independent claim 1 recites a limitation “receiving information, performing a first and second visits, providing warnings including disconnection notice and collection of equipment. However, these steps are not concrete and tangible. Specifically, for the aforementioned steps to be concrete, they must have a result that can be substantially repeatable or the steps must substantially produce the same result again. In re Swartz, 232 F.3d 862, 864 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (where asserted result produced by the claimed invention is “irreproducible” claim should be rejected under section 101). It is not clear what the repeatable and predictable result would be to providing warnings to customers and then visiting the customer a second time. Also, it is not clear what the tangible result would be upon visiting the customer the second time. Therefore, claimed invention(s) when viewed as a whole fail to produce a tangible and concrete result and therefore is analyzed as non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 and 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. Particularly in claim 1, it is not clear how the method achieves retaining a customer as recited in the preamble. Also, it is unclear who is receiving information from the service provider, who performs the visits and provides the warning.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by City of Akron News Release (hereinafter referred to as Akron).

Re claims 1-3: Akron teaches the steps of providing a warning to a customer (Para 5: *An account will be subject to disconnection notice (currently a yellow door tag)*).

Re claims 7: Akron teaches the steps of disconnecting the customer location if the customer does not pay (Para 10: *Once account is notified of disconnection, customer must pay past due balance within 48 hours*).

Re claim 8: Akron teaches the steps reconnecting the customer location if the customer pays the owed amount (Para 13: *Payment in full cancels turn off procedure*).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akron.

Re claims 15, 19, and 20: Akron is as discussed above. Akron does not explicitly receiving a work order for each customer, each work order including an owed amount and updating a work order for the customer. Official notice is hereby taken that receiving a work order for each customer, each work order including an owed amount and updating a work order for the customer is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Akron to include receiving a work order for each customer, each work order including an owed amount and updating a work order for the customer in order to track and identify delinquent customers.

Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akron in view of Kenny et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 20020007295) (hereinafter referred to as Kenny).

Re claims 6 and 9: Akron is as discussed above. Akron does not explicitly teach collecting any equipment owned by the service provider at the customer location. Kenny teaches collecting any equipment owned by the service provider at the customer location ([section 0139]: *The information is used to contact the customer and recover the property if the account becomes delinquent*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Akron to include collecting any equipment owned by the service provider at the customer location as taught by Kenny so that the provider can take possession of his property, for example vehicle repossession due to non-payment of loan.

Claims 10-12, 14, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akron in view of Vermont Public Service Board, Cable Television, Section 8.340- Billing Practices (hereinafter referred to as Vermont).

Acron is as discussed above. Akron does not explicitly teach that the notice indicates that the customer has been disconnected. Vermont teaches that the notice indicates that the customer has been disconnected (Pg 3 of 4, item (C): *the company may disconnect the customer, but must leave a written notice explaining why the service was terminated and what must be done to have it restored*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Akron to include a notice that the customer has been disconnected in so that the customer is aware of such disconnection and why.

Re claims 13: See claim 1 analysis, supra.

Re claims 16, 17, and 22: Akron is as discussed above. Akron does not explicitly teach checking the presence of the customer and asking the customer to pay an owed amount if the customer is present. Vermont teaches checking the presence of the customer and asking the customer to pay an owed amount if the customer is present (Pg 3 of 4, item (F): *When the company representative is at the subscriber's residence and the subscriber pays the amount in arrear in lieu of disconnection..*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Akron to include checking the presence of the customer and asking the customer to pay an owed amount if the customer is present as taught by Vermont to provide the customer a final opportunity to pay up before disconnection.

Re claim 18: See claim 7 analysis, supra

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 571-272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA



HANI M. KAZIMI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER